

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,202	01/16/2001	James E. Mathews	03797.00090 6561	
28319 7	590 11/06/2002			
	WITCOFF LTD.,	EXAMINER		
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT 1001 G STREET , N.W. ELEVENTH STREET			NGUYEN, JENNIFER T	
	N, DC 20001-4597		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2674	
			DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•		09/759,202	MATHEWS ET AL.			
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jennifer T Nguyen	2674			
Period for F	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address			
THE MA - Extensio after SIX - If the per - If NO per - Failure to - Any reply	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ILLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Ins of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. iod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply riod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or received by the Office later than three months after the mailing atent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).			
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 J	lanuary 2001 .				
2a)□ T	his action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
C	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ CI	aim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application					
4a)) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5)□ CI	aim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ CI	aim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are rejected.					
7)□ CI	aim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) <u></u> CI	aim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application		•				
9)□ The	e specification is objected to by the Examiner	•				
10)□ The	e drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	ted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.			
	applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •			
11)□ The	e proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disap	proved by the Examiner.			
If	approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	ly to this Office action.				
12)∐ Th∈	e oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.				
Priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)□ Ac	knowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)□ <i>i</i>	All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:					
1.[Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2.[Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Appli	cation No			
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached detailed Office action for a list of the prior applies of the prior application from the attached detailed Office action for a list of the attached de	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
	nowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	•				
_ a) [The translation of the foreign language pro- nowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	visional application has been	received.			
Attachment(s)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
2) Notice of 3) Information	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Inform	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
J.S. Patent and Traden PTO-326 (Rev. 04		tion Summary	Part of Paper No. 4			

Art Unit: 2674

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-14, 16-33 and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardin, Sr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,817,034).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, referring to Figs. 1 and 8A, Hardin teaches a method for detecting an in air gesture comprising step of : determining whether a digitizing pen (22) is not in contact with a digitizing writing surface (20); determining whether the digitizing pen (22) is in motion with respect to the digitizing writing surface (20); recording positional information of the digitizing pen (22) with respect to the surface of the digitizing writing surface (20) within a moving buffer (14) when the digitizing pen (22) is determined to not be in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20) and when the digitizing pen (22) is determined to be in motion with respect to the digitizing writing surface (20), the moving buffer (14) recording a predetermined amount of positional information spanning a predetermined amount of time while

Art Unit: 2674

the digitizing pen (22) is in motion and not in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20); determining when the digitizing pen (22) has stopped motion with respect to the surface of the digitizing writing surface (20) while the digitizing pen (22) is not in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20); and determining whether positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Regarding claims 2 and 21, Hardin teaches displaying (12) a predetermined user interface panel when the positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (Fig. 1 and from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Regarding claims 3-7 and 22-26, Hardin teaches the in-air gesture is a down spike motion, up spike motion, right spike motion, left spike motion (col. 15, lines 32-67 and col. 16, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 11-13 and 30-32, Hardin teaches positional information recorded in the moving buffer corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture is based on a detected motion shape, motion size, motion speed (col. 15, lines 32-67 and col. 16, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 8 and 27, Hardin teaches the predetermined amount of positional information is about 200 points of coordinate information (col. 10, lines 50-55).

Regarding claims 9 and 28, Hardin teaches the predetermined amount of time that positional information is recorded in the moving buffer is about 1 second (col. 10, lines 50-55).

Regarding claims 10 and 29, Hardin teaches the moving buffer (14) includes positional information corresponding to a starting point and an ending point, and wherein the step of

Art Unit: 2674

determining whether positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to the predetermined in-air gesture is based on a relative position of the starting point with respect to the ending point (from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Regarding claims 14 and 33, Hardin teaches the digitizing pen (22) and digitizing writing surface (20) are electromagnetic devices (col. 3, lines 45-50).

Regarding claims 16 and 35, Hardin teaches the digitizing pen (22) is not in contact with the digitizing writing surface (20) includes a step of receiving an input indicating that the digitizing pen (22) is in a hovering state (col. 11, lines 14-23, col. 15, lines 23-67).

Regarding claims 17, 18, 36 and 37, Hardin teaches sending a predetermined sequence of characters to an application program when the positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (col. 2, lines 1-8).

Regarding claims 19 and 38, Hardin teaches sending a predetermined command to an application program when the positional information recorded in the moving buffer (14) corresponds to a predetermined in-air gesture that can be made with the digitizing pen (22) (from col. 10, line 50 to col. 11, line 23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2674

5. Claims 15 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardin, Sr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,817,034) in view of Black (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956).

Regarding claims 15 and 34, Hardin differs from claims 15 and 34 in that he not specifically teach the digitizing pen and digitizing writing surface are optical devices. However, referring to Figs. 1B and 2A, Black discloses digitizing pen and digitizing writing surface are optical devices (col. 19, lines 3-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the digitizing pen and digitizing writing surface are optical devices as taught by Black in the system of Hardin in order to provide a fine line pattern or image on the resist surface.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beaton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,340,979) teaches contextual gesture interface.

Ebisawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,802) teaches handwritten data input device having coordinate detection tablet.

Crooks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,587,560) teaches portable handwritten data capture device and method of using.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jennifer T. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-3225**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reach at **703-305-4709**.

Art Unit: 2674

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, sixth-floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Jennifer T. Nguyen Patent Examiner Art Unit 2674

> RICHARD HJERPE PERUSORY PATENT EXAMINES

TECHNOLOGY CERTER 2000